

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 under the second paragraph of section 112, rejected claims 1 – 4, 10, 12 – 14, and 16 – 21 as obvious over Housfield and Weil, and indicated that claims 5 – 8, 11 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and that claim 9 would be allowable if amended to overcome the 112 rejection and redrafted in independent form.

### **35 USC §112, 2<sup>ND</sup> ¶**

The claims have been amended to overcome the antecedent basis rejection. In particular, claim 8 is amended to depend from claim 5, where the carrier ring is introduced. Claim 9 depends from claim 8, so antecedent basis is found for the terms of claim 9. Claim 10 is amended to depend directly from claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

### **35 USC §103(a)**

The applicant's respectfully disagree with the position of the examiner. The examiner initially correctly states that a cooling method and cooling system for the components of a computer tomography system within a gantry housing is already described in the document by Hounsfield (US 4,115,697), and that this system also comprises an air feed element as well as flow elements which are arranged such that air is directly blown onto the components to be cooled. The examiner likewise correctly establishes that no air compressor is used in the document by Hounsfield, i.e. no cooling occurs with compressed air. The examiner then resorts to the document by Weil (US 3,151,471) and establishes that here an air compressor (36) is used in order to cool components in the housing of an electronic instrument. The examiner then draws a conclusion from this that the average man skilled in the art would combine the two documents without anything further in order to arrive at the subject matter of the patent claim 1.

However, this is recognizably not the case. According to the present patent claim 1, namely the "streaming elements" are "connected to receive the compressed air from that and disposed and formed such that the compressed air flows on to the components to be cooled." This means that it is an essential point of the system according to claim 1 that the compressed air flow directly arrives at the components to be cooled.

In contrast to this, according to the document by Weil the components are not cooled with compressed air. Compressed air is in fact initially generated with a compressor (35) at

the beginning of an entire air preparation chain, which compressed air is then subsequently dealt with (namely cooled and dehumidified) in various installations. However, before this air is then actually used for cooling, the compressed air is first sent through an “air expander” (22) in which the compressed air is expanded again. This air is then mixed with compartment air in an “air mixing chamber” and only then serves for cooling of the components within the housing of the electronic apparatus. This means that ultimately no cooling of the components with compressed air ultimately occurs in the method proposed in the document by Weil or, respectively, the system described there.

If one were to consequently combine the teachings from the document by Weil with the teachings from the document by Hounsfield, here as well ultimately no compressed air would be blown on the components within the gantry housing; rather, only the air would be used that is used by the ventilator (29) in the gantry foot of the system by Hounsfield (prepared via a corresponding device, as it is shown in Figure 1 of the document by Weil outside of the building in which the electronic apparatus is located). This means that here air would initially be compressed, subsequently correspondingly cooled and dehumidified, and the compressed air would ultimately be decompressed again and this air would be blow in the direction of the gantry housing with the ventilator (29) in the manner described by Hounsfield. The cooling would thereby be implemented according to Hounsfield, such that the heat arising at the components is dissipated with a coolant fluid in the typical manner. In the operating pauses, the pretreated, cooled air thus flows from the blower (29) over a radiator located within the coolant fluid circuit.

However, in no manner whatsoever does the idea to flow compressed air directly over the individual components within the gantry in order to cool them result for the average man skilled in the art from the combination of the two references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention as defined in claim 1 is a non-obvious improvement over the prior art, whether considered alone or in combination.



## Conclusion

Each issue of the office action has been addressed. All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (#31,870)


Melvin A. Robinson  
Schiff Hardin LLP  
Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312-258-5785  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on June 9, 2006.

  
Melvin A. Robinson

CH1\ 4595465.1